



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,687	11/19/2003	Charles Jeff Morgan	20501/553	6600
32847	7590	05/30/2008	EXAMINER	
THE OLLILA LAW GROUP LLC 2060 BROADWAY SUITE 300 BOULDER, CO 80302			CHARLES, MARCUS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3682	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/30/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10716687	11/19/2003	MORGAN, CHARLES JEFF	20501/553

EXAMINER

Marcus Charles

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

3682 20080525

DATE MAILED:

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner for Patents**

This correspondence is a correction to the examiner's answer filed 01-11-2007, correcting section 9 (Grounds of Rejection) of the examiner's answer by including the claims listing in the final rejection.

**(10) Response to Argument**

Regarding claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-16 and 19-20, appellant argues that the prior art fails to anticipate each element of the claims, in that Lawroski fails to disclose the shaft having a normal belt position set forth in claims 1 and 14. In response, the claims are to a subcombination apparatus, only drawn to a shaft not a belt plus shaft. (2. In appellant's shaft, the normal belt position is merely a straight section (see marked-up fig. 1 below). Lawroski also discloses a shaft (38) having a straight section similar to that of appellant's (see marked-up fig. 1A below). Therefore, this meets the apparatus limitation since the structures are identical. In addition, appellant argues that Lawroski's groove is not angled because it is curved. However, a curved groove is made up of an infinite number of angles. Applicant doesn't state a specific type of angle (i.e. sharpe or curve). Therefore, Lawroski's curved grooved meets this limitation (see marked-up fig. 1A below).

/Marcus Charles/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3682